

1 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE
2 REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

3
4 PUBLIC MEETING

5
6
7 VOLUME I

8
9
10 Crowne Plaza
11 Anchorage, Alaska
12 March 11, 2014
13 9:00 a.m.

14
15
16
17 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 18
19 Ralph Lohse, Chairman
20 Judy Caminer
21 Greg Encelewski
22 Andrew McLaughlin - Telephonic
23 Mary Ann Mills
24 Michael Opheim - Telephonic
25 James Showalter
26 William C. Shuster
27 Gloria Stickwan
28
29 Regional Council Coordinator, Donald Mike

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 Recorded and transcribed by:

37
38 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
39 135 Christensen Drive, Suite 2
40 Anchorage, AK 99501
41 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 3/11/2014)

(On record)

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is the Southcentral Alaska Regional Advisory Council meeting in March of 2014.

And at this point in time I'd like to ask Donald to make a roll call and establish quorum for us.

MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is Donald Mike for roll call for the Southcentral Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting.

Mr. Rob Henrichs. Mr. Chair. I received an email from Mr. Henrichs stating that he was weathered in and he also fell ill, so he couldn't make this meeting and asked to be excused.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll excuse him.

MR. MIKE: Ms. Mary Ann Mills.

MS. MILLS: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Greg Encelewski.

MR. ENCELEWSKI: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. William Shuster.

MR. SHUSTER: Here.

MR. MIKE: Ms. Gloria Stickwan.

MS. STICKWAN: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. James Showalter.

MR. SHOWALTER: Here.

MR. MIKE: Mr. Michael Opheim. Mr. Chair. Mr. Opheim recently had back surgery, and he was not able to travel due to doctor's orders.

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Then he's excused.

1 MR. MIKE: Mr. Andrew McLaughlin.
2
3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Present
4 telephonically.
5
6 MR. MIKE: Ms. Judy Caminer.
7
8 MS. CAMINER: Here.
9
10 MR. MIKE: Mr. Ralph Lohse.
11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Present.
13
14 MR. MIKE: Mr. Thomas Carpenter. Mr.
15 Chair. Mr. Carpenter called and sent me an email
16 saying that he had prior commitments for an oil spill
17 drill in Cordova, and he couldn't make this meeting.
18
19 Mr. Herman Moonin. Mr. Chair. I made
20 efforts to contact Mr. Moonin, requesting his intent to
21 come to this meeting, and I was unable to contact him
22 through email or telephone.
23
24 Mr. Encelewski has some comment.
25
26 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah, I've got a
27 comment. I ran into Moonin just yesterday or the day
28 before. He was going to try and contact you. He was
29 kind of hooked up. He said he needed to talk to you.
30 That's all I know.
31
32 MR. MIKE: And, Mr. Chair, I wasn't
33 able to contact Mr. Moonin, and I didn't get any voice
34 mail or email from Mr. Moonin.
35
36 Thank you.
37
38 You have a quorum, Mr. Chair.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a quorum.
41 We'll hear from Mr. Moonin next meeting and decide
42 whether it was excused or unexcused.
43
44 Okay. With that we have roll call and
45 quorum.
46
47 And I'd like to call this meeting of
48 the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory
49 Council to order then.
50

1 And I'd like to welcome all of you
2 here. We've got a lot to do in the next couple days.
3
4 At this point in time, I'd like to have
5 everybody go around the table and introduce themselves,
6 and everybody in the audience introduce themselves.
7 And I'd like to welcome you all.
8
9 So let's start with Gloria and come
10 right around.
11
12 MS. STICKWAN: Gloria Stickwan,
13 Tazlina.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.
16
17 MR. SHOWALTER: James Showalter from
18 Sterling.
19
20 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Greg Encelewski. I'm
21 from Ninilchik.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Robert Lohse, Copper
24 Basin.
25
26 MS. CAMINER: Judy Caminer, Anchorage.
27
28 MS. MILLS: Mary Ann Mills, Sterling
29 and also Kenai.
30
31 MR. SHUSTER: Bill Shuster, Cooper
32 Landing.
33
34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Donald Mike.
35
36 MR. MIKE: Donald Mike, Council
37 coordinator.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Barbara.
40
41 MS. CELLARIUS: Barbara Cellarius. I'm
42 the subsistence coordinator for Wrangell-St. Elias
43 National Park and Preserve, based in Copper Center.
44
45 MS. LAVINE: Robbin Lavine with the
46 Division of Subsistence.
47
48 MS. HYER: Karen Hyer with OSM.
49
50 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli, BIA,

1 Anchorage, subsistence anthropologist.

2

3 MR. EVANS: Tom Evans, OSM, wildlife
4 biologist.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And one more in the
7 front row that just sat down.

8

9 MR. JOHNSON: Carl Johnson, Council
10 Coordination Division chief at OSM.

11

12 MS. KENNER: And Pippa Kenner with OSM,
13 anthropologist here in Anchorage.

14

15 MR. MASON: Floyd Mason (ph), National
16 Park Service, Anchorage.

17

18 MR. KRON: Tom Kron, OSM.

19

20 MR. CRAWFORD: Drew Crawford, Alaska
21 Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Subsistence
22 Liaison Team.

23

24 MR. ANDERSON: Jeff Anderson, U.S. Fish
25 and Wildlife Service. I'm the field office supervisor
26 in the Kenai Fish and Wildlife field office, and also
27 the Cook Inlet Federal in-season fisheries manager.

28

29 MR. SLOAN: Robert Sloan (ph), I'm the
30 deputy district ranger (Indiscernible - away from
31 microphones) Chugach and (indiscernible) working out of
32 the Seward Ranger District.

33

34 MR. LUNTRUM: Chris Luntrum (ph),
35 patrol captain for law enforcement (Indiscernible -
36 away from microphones) for the Forest Service here at
37 Chugach Anchorage.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Chugach Anchorage.

40

41 MR. BURCHAM: Milo Burcham, wildlife
42 biologist and subsistence lead for the Chugach Forest.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you all, and
45 thank you all for being here.

46

47 With that, like I said, we're going to
48 try to move fairly fast, because we have a lot to try
49 to accomplish today. So we're going to review and
50 adopt our agenda that we have sitting here in front of

1 us.

2

3 And there are some time certain things
4 that Donald would like to bring to our attention. And
5 if you can do that at this point, Donald.

6

7 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just
8 for the Council's reference, the Southcentral's agenda
9 starts on Page 5 for this part of the session.

10

11 And for the wildlife proposal, WP14-11,
12 which was deferred at our last October meeting for this
13 meeting cycle, we need to address that wildlife
14 proposal for the Staff Committee in preparation of the
15 upcoming Federal Subsistence Board. So if this Council
16 can take up this wildlife proposal after reviewing and
17 adopting of the agenda, that will start our business
18 for the day.

19

20 Mr. Chair. Thank you.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you would suggest
23 that we do it after reviewing and adopting the agenda,
24 not after reviewing and approving the previous meeting
25 minutes.

26

27 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. I would do it
28 after election of officers, if that's the wish of the
29 Council.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Judy.

32

33 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I was going
34 to bring this up later, but maybe this is the right
35 time.

36

37 We had a subcommittee, and Greg and
38 Mary Ann was on that with me, and Gloria -- maybe not
39 Mary Ann, sorry. And we were working with three
40 members from Southeast on preparing the joint agenda.
41 And we had -- and we talked this over quite a bit. We
42 had determined timeframes for each of the topics, which
43 I'm not seeing on the agenda. And I think we all felt
44 pretty strongly that we needed to have those certain
45 times as well as time limits, otherwise we'll never get
46 through it. We've got a lot of really excellent topics
47 to talk about that both Councils wanted to, but we
48 really have to set the time limits we thought.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I see that they're not

1 on the agenda, but I know we've discussed these time
2 limits like yesterday when Robert and Donald and I and
3 Bert got together.

4

5 Donald.

6

7 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
8 Member Caminer. Robert Larson and I met with Chair
9 Lohse and Chair Bert Adams last night to go over the
10 joint meeting agenda. And in cooperation with Robert
11 Larson, he and I discussed the time limits on the joint
12 agenda items. And prior to reconvening in a joint
13 session, I will provide the times that we identified on
14 a joint session. So for your reference, I'll provide a
15 copy for all the Council members so they can follow
16 which agenda items falls into what time category.

17

18 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19

20 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. That would
21 certainly be really helpful, and I don't know if we
22 want to wait until the joint meeting to decide, or
23 maybe you've already discussed this, whether Robert and
24 Donald will be kind of the timekeepers to let us know
25 we're getting close.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They already discussed
28 the fact that they would be timekeepers, because both
29 of the Chairs have a tendency to go too long.

30

31 (Laughter)

32

33 MS. CAMINER: It will be a challenge.

34

35 (Laughter)

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that,
38 we're trying to make some time right now, too.

39

40 MS. CAMINER: Right.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So at this point in
43 time, if we want to review the agenda that's in front
44 of us, and a motion to accept the agenda, and then we
45 can amend it, is in order. Do I hear somebody move.

46

47 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll so move to adopt
48 the agenda with the amendment of Wildlife Proposal 14-
49 11 under election of officers, before number 6.

50

1 MS. MILLS: Second.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. That was not a
4 legal motion under Robert's Rules of Order. You can
5 move to adopt the agenda, and then we can move to make
6 the amendment.
7
8 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I adopted it
9 before I moved it, see. I move to adopt it then.
10
11 MS. MILLS: I second.
12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And Mary Ann seconded
14 it. Okay. Any discussion. Does anybody see anything
15 that needs discussed on it.
16
17 (No comments)
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: A motion to amend it
20 is in order now if somebody would like to make a motion
21 to amend it.
22
23 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I move to amend it,
24 Mr. Chairman, to add Wildlife Proposal 14-11 after
25 election of officers.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do I hear a
28 second.
29
30 MS. MILLS: I second.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And it's been moved
33 and seconded to move Wildlife 14-11 to after the
34 election of officers. And any discussion.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 MS. MILLS: Call for the question. The
39 question's been called. All in favor signify by saying
40 aye.
41
42 IN UNISON: Aye.
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
45 saying no.
46
47 (No opposing votes)
48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
50 Amendment carries.

1 Okay. Now we have an amended motion on
2 the table. Is there any discussion on the amended
3 motion on the agenda that's right in front of us. Does
4 anybody see any changes or additions or corrections
5 that need -- Donald, do you have any that you would
6 like to add. Barbara.

7
8 MS. CELLARIUS: Mr. Chair. Part of my
9 agency report is more appropriate to give just to
10 Southcentral, rather than giving it in the joint
11 meeting. I think there's other agency reports on the
12 agenda, if you could add NPS to that for the last day
13 of your meeting.

14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Agency reports.
16 NPS is on here.

17
18 MS. CELLARIUS: What I'm saying is
19 that's part of the joint meeting. And some of what I
20 have to report I think is more appropriate to give just
21 to Southcentral.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

24
25 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. That would be an
26 agenda item.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. So we'll put
29 the NPS report under report. And that's the SRC,
30 right?

31
32 MS. CELLARIUS: It's actually NPS.
33 It's one sort of region-wide thing, and then some
34 things from Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Thank you.
37 Okay. Is there any objections to the addition of that
38 under agency reports.

39
40 (No comments)

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think we have
43 to make a motion to amend it to put that on. Okay.
44 All in favor -- well, somebody call the question.

45
46 MS. CAMINER: Question.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
49 called. All in favor of the motion to adopt the agenda
50 as amended signify by saying aye.

1 IN UNISON: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
4 saying nay.
5
6 (No opposing votes)
7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
9
10 Okay. At this point in time we need to
11 elect our officers. The only thing that I have to add
12 to this is as Mr. Carpenter has asked, and it doesn't
13 have to be held to, but he has asked that if possible
14 somebody else take the Vice Chair. He feels like he
15 has enough other things going on that he doesn't feel
16 like he's doing justice to it.
17
18 Mary Ann.
19
20 MS. MILLS: Yes, I'd like to nominate
21 Greg Encelewski.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: First we have to elect
24 the Chair.
25
26 MS. MILLS: Oh, okay. I am sorry.
27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So that we can -- and
29 I have to step down and Judy as the secretary is going
30 to take over getting nominations for Chair.
31
32 MS. MILLS: Oh, all right.
33
34 MS. CAMINER: Thank you. Do we have
35 any nominations for Chair of the Southcentral Council.
36
37 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll nominate Ralph
38 Lohse as the Chairman.
39
40 MS. CAMINER: Is there a second.
41
42 MS. MILLS: I second.
43
44 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'll second.
45
46 MS. CAMINER: Thank you, Anthony and
47 Mary Ann. Is everyone ready to -- are there any other
48 nominations, or are we ready to close nominations.
49
50 (No comments)

1 MS. CAMINER: All right. May we take a
2 vote then. All those in favor of Ralph Lohse for
3 continuing his chairmanship please say aye.
4
5 IN UNISON: Aye.
6
7 MS. CAMINER: Any opposed same sign.
8
9 (No opposing votes)
10
11 MS. CAMINER: Thank you.
12
13 Ralph, you're in.
14
15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that I
16 will take nominations for vice chair. Mary Ann.
17
18 MS. MILLS: I nominate Greg Encelewski.
19
20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'll second that.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
23 seconded for Greg Encelewski for the Vice Chair.
24
25 Do we have any other nominations.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing, let's have a
30 vote on Greg Encelewski. All in favor of Greg
31 Encelewski as Vice Chair signify by saying aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
36 saying nay.
37
38 (No opposing votes)
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You are now the.....
41
42 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Can I say nay?
43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're saying nay?
45
46 (Laughter)
47
48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: No. (Indiscernible -
49 mic not on)
50

1 (Laughter)
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Greg Encelewski
4 is our Vice Chair.
5
6 And now we need a nomination for
7 secretary. Nominations are open. Mary Ann.
8
9 MS. MILLS: I nominate Gloria Stickwan.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there a second.
12 Gloria.
13
14 MS. STICKWAN: I nominate Judy Caminer,
15 and I decline.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You decline. Okay.
18 We have Judy Caminer nominated. Do we have a second.
19
20 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll second.
21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
23 seconded for Judy Caminer for Secretary.
24
25 Any other nominations.
26
27 (No comments)
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none,
30 nominations are closed. All in favor of Judy Caminer
31 say aye.
32
33 IN UNISON: Aye.
34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed say nay.
36
37 (No opposing votes)
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Okay.
40 We now have a Chair, Vice Chair and a Secretary.
41
42 And so we will now go on to deferred
43 Wildlife Proposal 14-11, which is Kings Bay moose.
44 It's an .804, and it's deciding basically what we're
45 going to do with Kings Bay -- what our recommendations
46 are going to be on Kings Bay moose.
47
48 Donald.
49
50 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 I just want to ask Mr. McLaughlin if he
2 has the Staff analysis in front of him for him to refer
3 to.

4
5 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy, do you.....

8
9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, I did read the
10 booklet that I received in the mail on that. I do have
11 some commentary that I would like to add.

12
13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy.
14 Staff.

15
16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, would you
17 like that now.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, we're going to
20 have -- Staff's going to give a presentation first, and
21 then we'll go on to discussion, and then you can do
22 that, Andy.

23
24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Copy that. Thank you.

25
26 MR. EVANS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman
27 and members of the Council. My name is Tom Evans. I'm
28 a wildlife biologist with OSM, and Southcentral is one
29 of my regions.

30
31 I'm going to give you a brief review of
32 the wildlife stuff. You've see it all before, so I'll
33 be very brief, and then Milo will give a little update
34 maybe on the Kings Bay survey, because one of the
35 reasons it was deferred was to get some more
36 information. And then Pippa will follow up and do the
37 .804 analysis, and we'll go from there. And we're
38 doing this in kind of a hurried fashion, or putting it
39 up in the agenda so that the ISC can decide on it
40 tomorrow at lunchtime.

41
42 Okay. Proposal 14-11 was submitted by
43 Andy. It requests that Unit 7, that portion that
44 drains into Kings Bay be opened for a limited moose
45 hunt of one bull per community. The proponent didn't
46 Chenega Bay or Tatitlek to lose the occasional
47 opportunity to harvest moose in the area.

48
49 Currently Federal -- Judy?

50

1 MS. CAMINER: What page.

2

3 MR. EVANS: Oh, Page 70-71 in your
4 Council book.

5

6 Federal public lands are currently not
7 open to harvest a moose and it hasn't been opened since
8 2006.

9

10 Five moose were counted in the
11 2005/2006 census, and the average since 1996 has been
12 11.

13

14 So due to the variability of this
15 population, due to small population, low productivity,
16 relative isolation, limited safe calving habitat, and
17 steep terrain, and the presence of predators, brown and
18 black bears, this population is likely to remain small
19 and it's not a very viable population.

20

21 Harvest data indicates no moose were
22 harvested from 1997 to 2000. Five moose have been
23 harvested between 2000 to 2008 in the Nellie Juan
24 drainage under State regs. That area is typically
25 accessed by aircraft. The harvest was done by non-
26 Federally-qualified users.

27

28 The preliminary conclusion for OSM is
29 to oppose Proposal 14-11.

30

31 And as you know, we deferred this
32 proposal until we got some more information to this
33 meeting from last meeting.

34

35 Thank you.

36

37 MR. BURCHAM: Hello. This is Milo
38 Burcham, wildlife biologist with the Chugach Forest.

39

40 And I do have some new information to
41 bring to the table regarding this, and I just got this
42 email from the State biologist, Gino DelFrate, I think
43 on Friday, so this is brand new information. We
44 contracted with Fish and Game to conduct a survey of
45 Kings Bay to see what there was for moose in the area.
46 And they only got that survey in last week.

47

48 And unfortunately it doesn't help our
49 interest here. Just real quick, he says, I know Milo
50 will be traveling to the RAC meeting and would like

1 the information. A formal report will be available in
2 a few weeks.

3

4 The Kings River Valley and the Nellie
5 Juan River Valley had excellent survey conditions, but
6 no moose or moose tracks were observed during a 62-
7 minute survey of this portion. He also added a side
8 note that on their way back they flew the area south of
9 Nellie Juan Lake to Day Harbor, a separate drainage,
10 and they did see eight adult moose and zero calves
11 closer to Day Harbor. That might be of interest to
12 people in Chenega Bay. It's not related to this Kings
13 Bay proposal, but that's an area that is possibly
14 accessed by ocean, you know, for Chenega Bay residents.
15 A small number of moose were seen in that area.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But his report was no
18 moose?

19

20 MR. BURCHAM: No moose or tracks in
21 excellent survey conditions.

22

23 And I had come to this meeting
24 anticipating, you know, finding some creative, very
25 conservative proposals for amending this proposal, you
26 know, to make something fly. But in the light of this
27 information, you know, it's probably not even worth
28 going through that right now. And I guess I personally
29 would think it would be worth tabling this proposal or
30 the idea of opening a season until we see some moose in
31 there, or have information that there's moose in there.
32 And I think it's worth continuing to monitor, because
33 there have been moose in there in the past.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: One question, Milo.
36 From your experience, is it an area that -- I don't
37 know what the snow conditions are there this winter,
38 but is it an area that snow conditions could drive the
39 moose out, and would they have some place to drive out
40 to, or would they pretty much -- that would pretty
41 moose that would be there, would be there?

42

43 MR. BURCHAM: Now, that's a very good
44 question. And I have limited personal knowledge of
45 that drainage, and that might be the case for everybody
46 in this population. Maybe Andy has a little more
47 personal knowledge with the area.

48

49 My understanding of what might be going
50 on there, and it would take research, possibly even

1 collaring moose to figure this out, is it sounds like
2 it's a relatively isolated piece of moose habitat that
3 probably gets some influx from the main Kenai
4 Peninsula, but that exchange might be really limited.
5 You know, it's a long distance, a long, narrow valley,
6 you know, that Nellie Juan Valley that connects it to
7 the main Kenai moose population. So it's a bit of a
8 fragment with some, you know, very loose connection
9 with the rest of -- other moose populations.

10

11 And from what I've heard in the past,
12 moose do winter there. And the fact that no moose were
13 seen in a winter survey is alarming, given that they've
14 been counted in the same manner in the past. So even
15 though moose could show up, or there might still be
16 some moose in there, it sounds like there's even a
17 smaller number than what has been there in the past
18 when these other surveys have been flown. And I think
19 it's worth continuing to look. You know, it's possible
20 they missed moose. But I don't think that a body of
21 moose, a group of moose from the main Kenai Peninsula
22 will show up here in the fall for hunting season. I
23 think it's a relatively, you know, self-sufficient
24 population in the past with that minimal exchange from
25 the interior of the Kenai Peninsula, and maybe that
26 little remnant population is much reduced now.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So you don't feel like
29 it's an area that they migrate back and forth to, but
30 they could -- individuals could migrate in there and
31 start a population?

32

33 MR. BURCHAM: Well, that's possible.
34 And again I don't know, and it would take, you know,
35 radio collar type data to figure something like that
36 out. You know, the snapshots that we get from these
37 surveys isn't enough to determine that necessarily.
38 But the fact that moose have wintered there in the
39 past, and none appear to be there now, or very few, is
40 alarming.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

43

44 MS. CAMINER: I just want to ask Milo,
45 is 60 minutes enough for this area? Is that an
46 adequate survey time?

47

48 MR. BURCHAM: That sounds like a small
49 amount of time, but, no, I think it is. In a Super Cub
50 you can cover a lot of ground, and it's a pretty

1 confined area. It's a narrow drainage with a little
2 bottom, you know, low land habitat near the ocean, and
3 that follows the drainage up Nellie Juan River a little
4 bit, and then a little bit of Kings River. So, yeah,
5 that sounds like an adequate effort, and that's what
6 Fish and Game was charged was to do, and so I trust
7 that they put an adequate effort in.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

10

11 MS. MILLS: are there any problems with
12 predation.

13

14 MR. BURCHAM: There would likely be
15 brown bears in the area, which could prey on calves,
16 but I don't have enough personal knowledge of that
17 population to say what kind of problem that would be.
18 I suspect the area is exposed to a lot of snow in
19 winter, that habitat could be a real problem, wintering
20 habitat could be a problem in western Prince William
21 Sound.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

24

25 MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. Did you ask Gino
26 about the Day Harbor population, whether he thought it
27 could be coming from Nellie Juan.

28

29 MR. BURCHAM: No, I did not. I had to
30 look on a map and see where Day Harbor was. That
31 topography on the Kenai Peninsula is pretty steep, you
32 know, with good ridges in between drainages. And so
33 it's possible that it's not easy for moose to get from
34 one drainage to the next without going to, you know,
35 the start of the drainage or to the head of the
36 drainage or something. So I'd have to look at a map a
37 little more closely to see if that's possible. And we
38 will be getting a more formal report from the State.
39 This is, you know, a quick note to me so I could
40 present something at the meeting.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo.

43

44 Mary Ann, I don't know too much about
45 the brown bear predation there, but they do have a lot
46 of black bear on that side of the Sound. And I know
47 when Bob Topi (ph) did his moose collaring in the
48 Wrangell-St. Elias, the predation by black bear on
49 calves would be -- if you had a very small population,
50 would be very easy to maintain a no survival.

1 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah. I mentioned just
2 brown bears, because that's unusual for western Prince
3 William Sound to have brown bears, but the Nellie Juan
4 drainage does. Of course, black bears are all over
5 western Prince William Sound.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
8 for Milo.

9
10 (No comments)

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Milo, for
13 that piece of information, but it does complicate
14 things.

15
16 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, it wasn't good
17 news. And I would be happy to present some
18 conservative proposals or amendments if you guys
19 considered taking some positive action on this, but
20 right now, in the light of this information, it
21 probably doesn't seem wise.

22
23 MS. KENNER: Good morning, Mr. Chair.
24 Members of the Council. Again my name is Pippa Kenner,
25 and I'm with OSM here in Anchorage.

26
27 Part of the analysis for this proposal
28 began at your last meeting where the Council requested
29 that Staff write a Section .804 of ANILCA determination
30 concerning who would be eligible to hunt in the Kings
31 Bay drainage area of Unit 7.

32
33 So the Southeast Council asked the
34 Board to allow only some Federally-qualified
35 subsistence users to harvest moose from the hunt area,
36 and that determination of who will be eligible be based
37 on three criteria of Section .804, including (1)
38 customary and direct dependence upon the moose in the
39 hunt area as the mainstay of livelihood; (2) the
40 proximity to the moose in the hunt area; and (3) the
41 availability of alternative subsistence resources.

42
43 And the circumstances for the request
44 is that the Southeast Council anticipates that the
45 Board will re-open the hunt area -- Southcentral
46 Council anticipates that the Board will re-open the
47 hunt area to harvest of moose by Federally-qualified
48 subsistence users in fall 2014. Right. So the reason
49 why we're doing a Section .804 analysis is because
50 there may be an open hunt season. if this occurs,

1 there will be a small number of moose available to
2 harvest relative to the large number of subsistence
3 users with a customary and traditional use
4 determination to harvest moose. In fact, the residents
5 of Chenega Bay, Cooper Landing, Hope, and Tatitlek.
6 The potential for harvest to exceed the harvestable
7 surplus is considered high, and Section .804 analysis
8 is necessary to determine which of the four communities
9 will be eligible to harvest moose from the hunt area.

10

11 And again only those people who are
12 permanent residents in Chenega Bay, Cooper Landing,
13 Hope, or Tatitlek can be considered for eligibility
14 through this Section .804 determination.

15

16 The OSM conclusion of the Section .804
17 analysis indicates that the seemingly low dependence on
18 this population of moose by residents of Chenega Bay
19 and Tatitlek is attributable in part to the
20 continuously restricted hunting seasons. The low
21 dependence on the moose population in the hunt area by
22 the residents of Cooper Landing and Hope is likely due
23 to the restricting hunting seasons, and to the
24 difficulty accessing the area. The area is not
25 accessible by highway vehicle. However, none of the
26 communities is located in or immediately adjacent to
27 the hunt area.

28

29 On balance, it appears that residents
30 of only Chenega Bay and Tatitlek should be eligible to
31 be included in the Section .804 determination based on
32 the three criteria, primarily based on the lack of
33 alternative populations of moose outside of the Kings
34 Bay drainage of Unit 7, and the availability of moose
35 in the remainder of Unit 7 for residents of Hope and
36 Cooper Landing.

37

38 I have more details on the .804
39 determination if you request it, but for right now,
40 that's the end of my presentation.

41

42 Thank you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
45 questions.

46

47 (No comments)

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have one question.
50 When it says the mainstay, does that mean the mainstay

1 of access to that subsistence resource, or does that
2 mean the mainstay in conjunction with all current
3 subsistence resources?

4
5 MS. KENNER: Thank you for that
6 question, Mr. Chair. Let's read it. Customary and
7 traditional -- customary and direct dependence upon the
8 resource as the mainstay of livelihood.

9
10 We look at this in a number of ways,
11 depending on the specific details of the situation;
12 however, in this situation particularly, we're thinking
13 about it as not only the moose that are in the hunt
14 area, but moose that may be available as alternative
15 populations of moose.

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So basically we're
18 concentrating on moose, not on other resources then.

19
20 MS. KENNER: For this particular -- for
21 criterion 1, you are correct.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

24
25 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

28
29 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, I would concur
30 with that. That's how we read it here is moose meat
31 resource in particular, not like substituting deer or
32 clams or some other alternate food, but specifically
33 moose. And those are the only moose available in
34 western Prince William Sound, to the community.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy.

37
38 Bill.

39
40 MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. You said Cooper
41 Landing and Hope have access to the moose in Unit 7.
42 Did you look at the harvest data to see how many moose
43 are shot in Unit 7 last year, which is just about none.
44 So I don't know if that's a good reason to eliminate
45 Cooper Landing and Hope for that. I don't have the
46 numbers in front of me, but I thought on the Kenai the
47 majority was shot out of unit down near Homer and not
48 in Unit 7. I don't believe there were any subsistence
49 moose shot at all. And do you know of any. Yeah,
50 well, I think there was one. And how many was shot

1 through the normal season. I don't know, but I know
2 it's very little.

3

4 MS. KENNER: Mr. Shuster, through the
5 Chair. Thank you for that question. You're right, it
6 is low. And what I have readily available to me was
7 the harvest data through 2010.

8

9 And it appeared to give me enough
10 information in order to do the analysis of four -- here
11 it is. From 2008 -- oh, I did get it. From 2008 to
12 2012, 81 Cooper Landing hunters harvested five moose,
13 and two of the five were taken under Federal
14 regulations. And from 2010 to 2012, 48 Hope hunters
15 harvested only one moose from Unit 7 remainder, and the
16 moose was taken under Federal regulations. So here we
17 have a two-year spread and only one was taken recently
18 in Unit 7 Remainder. The opportunity is evidently
19 limited.

20

21 MR. SHUSTER: Okay. But 2003, it
22 dropped even more. So I would suggest that you get
23 that number and see whether that should be considered
24 on your summary.

25

26 MS. KENNER: Could you tell me
27 specifically what it was you just asked, something
28 about 2003?

29

30 MR. SHUSTER: Okay. In 2003 [sic],
31 this last year.

32

33 MS. KENNER: Oh, '13. Got it.

34

35 MR. SHUSTER: Yeah.

36

37 MS. KENNER: It was lower than less
38 than one?

39

40 MR. SHUSTER: Yes.

41

42 MS. KENNER: Well, we are already at
43 less than one. The indications are that Hope is able
44 to harvest to harvest less than one moose a year from
45 Unit 7 Remainder. I agree with you.

46

47 MR. SHUSTER: So should Cooper Landing
48 and Hope be dropped from this Proposal WP14-11, because
49 they have the rest of Unit 7 to hunt when there aren't
50 any moose for them to hunt.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Good question. Greg.
2
3 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, I would just
4 make a comment on that, Bill. I agree there's probably
5 little or hardly no moose taken in 7 like you say, even
6 all the more reason, I'm assuming that 7 has a lot more
7 moose even though there's a few, so there's probably
8 more of an opportunity. Just my comment. But I know
9 even on the Kenai our subsistence use in 15C is
10 extremely low also, and there's thousands of moose, but
11 it's fairly low.
12
13 Thank you.
14
15 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Judy.
18
19 MS. CAMINER: Thanks. I mean, are
20 there copies of .804 available to people.
21
22 MS. KENNER: Thank you for asking that.
23 Through the Chair. It is in your Council book on --
24 oh, just a minute, please.
25
26 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I mean, I
27 don't think it's essential, but it really would have
28 been helpful to have it in the book.
29
30 MS. KENNER: I've been assuming that --
31 I'm not quite sure how that happened. We must have
32 worked really hard to get the wrong analysis in the
33 book. How about if -- I assumed you had it. Okay. We
34 have two options. We can take it up -- I can get
35 copies made, and we can take it up again in maybe two
36 days when people have had a chance to read it, or I can
37 go over in more detail what the analysis says. I was
38 hoping not to waste your time unless you asked me to do
39 that.
40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is this draft Staff
42 analysis what we're talking about? It's more complete
43 than that.
44
45 MS. CAMINER: Where is it.
46
47 MS. KENNER: Mr. Chair, what is the
48 date on that.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: On this? This is

1 March 10th, 2014 on this piece of paper I have.

2

3 MS. KENNER: That is it.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's it.

6

7 MS. KENNER: The March 10th one -- oh,
8 hold it. Just a minute. No, I'm sorry, it's January
9 16th is the final -- well.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd say, would you
12 care, if you wish, can you take that and read that for
13 us. Basically what it looks to me like is we're
14 talking about a non-population in both areas.

15

16 MS. KENNER: Oh, these are my talking
17 points. Thank you, Mr. Chair. What you have before
18 you, and what was given to you, those are my talking
19 points. And in that -- so I just read the first part
20 of that. And then on the second and third pages I've
21 given myself more details in case I wasn't here and
22 somebody was asked.

23

24 Shall I go ahead and cover that.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, would you please
27 cover that just so we can have that information in
28 front of us. And that would be on Page 3, 4 and 5.

29

30 MS. CAMINER: We don't have it.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You don't have it.

33

34 MS. CAMINER: Yeah. Okay.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But if she covers it
37 verbally, then you'll at least have her -- in this
38 case, what we're dealing with is we're dealing a small
39 possible population, and that's what we need to keep
40 concentrated on. It's a small possible population in
41 Prince William Sound.

42

43 nd I don't know, if there's no
44 population there, whether we even have to decide what
45 an .804 is on it. But we could decide what an .804 is
46 in case there was a population in the future, but at
47 this point in time, it seems like a moot point.

48

49 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But would you go
2 through the 3, 4, and 5 for them. The talking points.

3
4 MS. KENNER: Yes, I will, Mr. Chair.
5 And I have several -- at the end we'll talk a little
6 bit about the purpose of the .804.

7
8 Okay. Concerning criterion 1,
9 customary and direct dependence upon the populations as
10 a mainstay of livelihood, an overview of the .804 under
11 criterion 1 is no residents of any of the four
12 communities has reported hunting or harvesting a moose
13 from the hunt area according to the Fish and Wildlife
14 Service and Fish and Game harvest reporting systems,
15 that's when you get a ticket and you give it back, from
16 1985 to 2010. Excuse me. And that information is
17 detailed in the analysis, in a table.

18
19 However, according to the recollections
20 of several hunters from Chenega Bay or Tatitlek, the
21 Kings Bay drainage has been used for moose hunting by
22 residents of these two villages since at least the
23 1960s. Moose harvest in the Kings Bay area have
24 typically taken place incidental to commercial fishing,
25 seal hunting, or goat hunting.

26
27 Concerning criterion number 2,
28 proximity to the resource, Chenega Bay is closest to
29 the hunt area. By water Chenega Bay is approximately
30 70 miles from the Kings Bay drainage. Residents of
31 Tatitlek are approximately 81 miles by water. Chenega
32 Bay and Tatitlek residents, especially those involved
33 in commercial fishing, have historically used
34 watercraft to travel to harvesting sites situated in
35 the Prince William Sound area.

36
37 Residents of Cooper Landing and Hope
38 live along the State highway system, and would drive to
39 Whittier and then travel 60 miles by boat to reach the
40 hunt area; otherwise walking through about 20 miles
41 through the Kenai Peninsula to the Nellie Juan drainage
42 would be necessary.

43
44 And concerning criterion 3, the
45 availability of alternative resources, first I looked
46 at the availability of alternative populations of
47 moose. Chenega Bay and Tatitlek are located in 6D.
48 The only moose endemic to Unit 6 are a small population
49 in the low river drainage adjacent to Valdez. The
50 population of the moose is about 40 animals. That

1 census was taken in 2009. Since 1985, only two
2 Tatitlek hunters have reported using the area, and no
3 Chenega Bay hunters. Neither was successful. 40 of 60
4 reported harvest in the low river drainage since 1985
5 were by residents of Valdez. While others have tried
6 to take a moose from the low river drainage, especially
7 from Anchorage and Cordova, few have been successful.
8 Most of the moose population in Unit 6 originated from
9 moose that were translocated from other areas of
10 Alaska. They were released on the Copper River Delta
11 in Unit 6C and the population expanded eastward, so
12 that's away from the villages.

13
14 Residents of Chenega Bay, Cooper
15 Landing, Hope and Tatitlek have been required to apply
16 for a State draw permit to hunt in Unit 6C. In 2013
17 471 applications were received, but only 7 permits were
18 issued, a 1 percent draw rate. So it's very hard to
19 hunt -- for these communities to hunt in Unit 6C. Only
20 one Tatitlek and one Cooper Landing resident have
21 reported hunting moose in Unit 6C since 1985.

22
23 Okay. So Cooper Landing and Hope are
24 located in Unit 7 Remainder. That is situated outside
25 of the Kings Bay drainage. The majority of hunters
26 took moose from Unit 7 Remainder. So from 1985 to 2010
27 -- we keep saying 1985, because that's when really
28 more precise records started being kept by the Alaska
29 Department of Fish and Game. So between 1985 and 2010
30 the majority of hunters, that is 40 -- okay, 46 percent
31 of the harvest of Cooper Landing and 50 percent of the
32 harvest from Hope have been in Unit 7 Remainder. Now,
33 that's over the course of, what, 25 years.

34
35 In 2008 a Federal season opened to
36 residents of Cooper Landing, and it opened to residents
37 of Hope in 2010 when this Council included them in the
38 C&T determinations. Subsistence hunters were given a
39 preference, and were allowed to harvest moose with
40 slightly less restrictive antler conditions. So from
41 2008 to 2012, 81 Cooper Landing hunters harvested 5
42 moose, and from 2010 to 2012, when this preference was
43 available to Hope hunters, 48 hunters harvested only 1
44 moose from Unit 7 Remainder.

45
46 Okay. Now, concerning alternative
47 subsistence resources, there is limited information. A
48 lot of that information that I would use would come
49 from harvest surveys, and we do have -- communities in
50 your area have participated in door-to-door harvest

1 surveys, but they also -- it's not recently. So
2 although other subsistence harvest information is
3 limited, it does provide a relative picture of other
4 available resources to the residents of the four
5 communities.

6
7 So for Chenega Bay, the small
8 population of people at Chenega Bay rely on wild
9 resources such as salmon, seal, halibut, herring,
10 rockfish, clams, deer, and goat to support their
11 subsistence way of life. Moose are an important
12 secondary resource. Residents reported harvesting less
13 than one moose per year from 1985 to 2010, compared
14 with 2,376 salmon, 46 seals, over 4,000 pounds of
15 halibut, 50 deer, and 320 rockfish in 2003, in one
16 year, the most recent year the survey was done.

17
18 So for Cooper Landing, I'm going to
19 give you similar information. Cooper Landing, and just
20 to explain, is a small, unincorporated community within
21 the Kenai Peninsula Borough. It has an estimated
22 population of 289. And although many of the housing
23 units are seasonal, there are permanent, full-time
24 residents, and these regulations would apply to the
25 permanent, full-time residents. Residents rely on
26 resources such as salmon, moose, caribou, deer,
27 halibut, and char to support their subsistence way of
28 life. And residents reported harvesting about nine
29 moose per year between 1985 and 2010, so that's nine
30 moose a year. Household harvest surveys conducted in
31 1990, very old, estimated that the permanent residents
32 of Cooper Landing harvested 2,236 salmon, 10 moose, 6
33 caribou, 17 deer, almost 2,000 pounds of halibut, and
34 814 char in one year.

35
36 For Hope, another small, unincorporated
37 community, 192 people, there are seasonal dwellings
38 there, but this regulation would only apply to the
39 permanent residents of Hope. And they rely on salmon,
40 moose, caribou, halibut, and char mainly. Moose are an
41 important secondary resource. Residents reported
42 harvesting almost three moose per year between 1985 and
43 2010. The household surveys that were conducted in
44 1990 indicated that Hope harvested almost 2,000 salmon,
45 6 moose, 8 caribou, about 800 pounds of halibut, and
46 about 650 char.

47
48 And then we have Tatitlek, 88 permanent
49 residents. Tatitlek relies on salmon, herring,
50 halibut, rockfish, seal, clams, deer, and goat as well

1 as many other resources. And residents reported
2 harvesting four moose total, less than one moose a year
3 between 1985 and 2010, compared with, and the most
4 survey I believe was in '03, and they harvested about
5 1,000 salmon, 87 seals, 86 gallons of herring, 1400
6 pounds of halibut, 30 deer, 572 rockfish. So that
7 included the discussion of alternative resources.

8

9 And then I come to the conclusion which
10 I think I'll just quickly go over again. Given all
11 that information, and the details are in tables at the
12 back of -- are included in the Section .804 analysis,
13 we commend a determination that only Tatitlek and
14 Chenega Bay now be included in the hunt area.

15

16 And the seemingly low dependence on the
17 population of moose by the residents of all these
18 communities has been probably based on restrictions and
19 the closures.

20

21 Additionally, there have been times
22 when residents of Cooper Landing and Hope were able to
23 get to other resources, to other populations of moose
24 to hunt.

25

26 The residents -- as far as proximity,
27 the residents of Cooper Landing and Hope, it's a little
28 bit more difficult for them to get to the area, but, of
29 course, none of the communities is located right near
30 or adjacent to the area.

31

32 And so the determination, the
33 recommended determination was to limit eligibility for
34 the hunt to just the communities of Tatitlek and
35 Chenega Bay based on that information.

36

37 Now, because of the recommended -- in
38 the proposal and the recommendation from the Council,
39 was to have an extremely limited moose hunt in this
40 area, I think it was to harvest one moose every years,
41 because of that, it is likely that the distribution of
42 that one permit wouldn't be on a first come, first
43 served basis. Or if permits were distributed to
44 anybody who wanted one, so many people would be hunting
45 in the area that more than one -- if more than one
46 moose was there, more than one moose would be taken.

47

48 So the purposes of the .804 is to allow
49 us to pick who would get the opportunity to hunt. It
50 could be a draw permit based on all the residents of

1 all the communities. The pool can be limited in part
2 through the Section .804 analysis that actually would
3 eliminate some communities from the hunt based on their
4 ability to hunt in other areas. So that's why we're
5 doing this is so that we have to limit the distribution
6 of permits in order to rationally administer the hunt
7 and allow only one moose to be taken.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the proposal that's
10 before us, if I understand correctly, is to decide an
11 .804 and set up a hunt, or is it to decide an .804.

12

13 MS. KENNER: Thank you for that
14 question, Mr. Chair. It's actually two steps. First,
15 the area is closed to the harvest of the non-Federally-
16 qualified. The area is currently closed to the non-
17 Federally-qualified. The next step is to open the area
18 to only the Federally-qualified. And the third step
19 would be to limit the distribution of permits based on
20 the outcome of the .804.

21

22 It is possible to adopt, other Councils
23 have, and the Board has adopted .804s in preparation
24 for the opening to come, so that the .804 would be in
25 the regulations and would show up in the regulation
26 booklet that only residents of these communities can
27 hunt in this area, but the season's closed.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

30

31 MS. MILLS: Thank you. I read a report
32 and it really resonated with me, that Alaska has become
33 the least productive hoofed wildlife harvest state in
34 the nation under Federal and state management of
35 wildlife and fish. And it seems as if we're not
36 addressing the cause of not having enough subsistence
37 animals and fish for the people, but we're not
38 addressing the cause. We're addressing cutting the
39 subsistence user off from foods and food security that
40 there normally has always been. And that's one of the
41 reasons I did question about predator predation and the
42 predator control, if the State implements a predator
43 control of the bears, the wolves and so forth. And it
44 seems like to me -- and this isn't just only in this
45 area, you find it up north, throughout the whole State.
46 The report that I had read was so alarming that I was
47 very happy to be on this Council to maybe address these
48 things.

49

50 So in the spirit of providing

1 subsistence opportunities for those in the rural
2 community, if there is a conservation concern, I think
3 these concerns need to be addressed so we don't just
4 keep cutting, cutting, cutting with the agencies doing
5 what they need to be doing by enhancing these animals.

6

7 Thank you.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, did you have
10 your hand up?

11

12 MR. SHUSTER: Yeah. This is -- during
13 your analysis on other resources that these communities
14 use, I don't know, is it appropriate that you're
15 looking at halibut when that hasn't -- we don't have
16 any control over here. That's NOAA that deals with
17 them, not us.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you like to
20 answer that.

21

22 MS. KENNER: Yes, I would.

23

24 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25

26 Mr. Shuster, through the Chair. That's
27 a very good question. When the language for the
28 Section .804 and the three criteria was being
29 developed, there was a concern that other available
30 alternatives would be adequate for some communities.
31 And that because they had abundant available
32 alternatives, the population that was the topic of the
33 analysis wasn't necessary for them in order to
34 maintain, to meet their subsistence needs. And it is
35 clear that they were talking about resources that the
36 Fish and Wildlife Service or the National Park Service
37 may not -- or the other agencies may not directly
38 manage.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, I think also
41 what that part of the survey is, has nothing to do with
42 whose got management over it. It's what does this
43 community use. And I know that we've looked at that
44 before, and it's just like seal is down on it. Lots of
45 people don't have access to seal, but the community
46 does use seal. It doesn't matter who manages it, the
47 community uses it. If you live on a river with char,
48 you have char. If you live on a river that's got
49 sheefish, you've got sheefish. If you live on an ocean
50 that's got king crab, or I know crab is on -- in

1 Southeastern crab is a subsistence resource, but, you
2 know, it's not managed by us, but it's something the
3 community does use. And from that standpoint, again,
4 like she was saying, that doesn't really affect the
5 dependence on moose, but it does show that this is a --
6 we use that all the time to show that a community is a
7 subsistence community, that they make use of the local
8 wild resources as part of their community lifestyle.
9 And so from that standpoint, to me, halibut is no
10 different than seal, than salmon, than rockfish, or any
11 of the rest of it. It's something my family eats or
12 your family eats or the community eats.

13

14 MR. SHUSTER: Okay.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions
17 for our anthropologist.

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Now we
22 have to decide where we go from here.

23

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy, I wanted to have
27 you on next. So would you give us your comments.

28

29 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. My comments
30 have been cut down about a third in light of this new
31 survey result.

32

33 It was mentioned the eight moose seen
34 at Day Harbor, maybe that's a possible thing. It's
35 never been -- it's not proximal to here, and it's never
36 been a travel route to access to there. It's limited.
37 There's no mooring, that type of thing, so that's kind
38 of a moot point. Thanks for the suggestion though.

39

40 I think the main issue is the
41 historical use of the Kings Bay moose.

42

43 This survey from last week is
44 incredibly disheartening, but that is exactly why we
45 needed this survey done in the first place. I was
46 ready to compare how Milo will get 50 permits out in
47 Cordova for 600 moose, which is a ratio of 1 to 12, and
48 that the.....

49

50 I'm sorry? Okay. I thought somebody

1 had interrupted.

2

3 Anyhow, through the Chair. The
4 average number of moose has been 11, which is pretty
5 close to that 12, and I was banking on the .804
6 analysis, which I concur with Pippa, what she mentioned
7 with the OSM report, and saying that Chenega Bay and
8 Tatitlek have that customary and traditional use, and
9 the three criteria met there. So it was -- the
10 original proposal was for all four communities. If it
11 was dropped down to one, I would have thought that
12 changing the proposal to make it one moose every four
13 regulatory years between the two communities of Chenega
14 Bay and Tatitlek. But I do not think that that is a
15 good idea now hearing this new survey.

16

17 Somebody had asked about displacement
18 of those moose. I have been to Kings Bay, and there's
19 no place for them to go. Deep winter snow is not going
20 to displace them, it's just going to take them out. I
21 know of one case where a hatchery personnel person saw
22 tracks which actually was many miles from the river
23 mouth of Kings Bay. I was pretty surprised. I think a
24 moose decided to go for some swims and went pretty far,
25 which brings to light that there is immigration and
26 emigration. In the summertime you see on a rare
27 occasion moose way up high in goat country. It's
28 rather amazing. In the winter time in particular, some
29 winters with these weird weather events that we have
30 with climate change these days, the moose I assume
31 would act similar to other ungulates, like how the deer
32 that one year that there was no winter at all, moved
33 from around Whittier all the way up to Potter Marsh, to
34 Anchorage even. Some of those lack of snow, they can
35 also emigrate that way.

36

37 The fact that there's no tracks right
38 now basically means there's no moose right now. I've
39 been there. I know the delta, the main delta of the
40 Nellie Juan River, and I've been a couple miles up the
41 Kings Bay -- or Kings River, the one to the north. And
42 both times I've seen some brown bear track. That's
43 definitely another issue with the predation. I've seen
44 calf tracks in late winter around the month of late
45 April. I've been there when there's snow all over the
46 place and seen lots of track where I knew there was at
47 least a half a dozen different moose just by the size
48 of the tracks, and they areas where they were.

49

50 I'd like to point out that this survey

1 is a snapshot in time, it's not the whole thing.
2 There's climate change issues. I'm going from my notes
3 here. Low productivity (ph) and extreme weather events
4 change the population obviously, very much like what's
5 going on with our deer, okay. I hope that these
6 weather events don't dominate the future population,
7 and I'm hoping that immigration occurs.

8
9 My thoughts right now also drift to
10 seeing what people were saying about the 1985 to 2010,
11 no record of subsistence harvest, that type of stuff.
12 I would like to request formal surveys. What's going
13 on is our elders are dying, okay. And there's a
14 generation gap here. And who the people that I know of
15 that killed moose there are not alive any more. One
16 person I know that did kill moose there is still alive.
17 I would ask Milo to document this somehow or go to U.S.
18 Fish and Wildlife Service to prove this historical use,
19 because I don't like hearing the notion that, oh, well,
20 there's no record of it, so it didn't happen type
21 thing. David Totemoff has specifically been involved
22 with moose there in years past. And everything else
23 would be second hand. I would definitely talk to
24 whatever elders are possible in the Village of Tatitlek
25 who knew Harley Salanoff. He passed away probably five
26 years ago. He was a dear friend of mine.

27
28 In light of this new conservation
29 concern, I am not at all interested in pushing this
30 proposal forward. I would like to thank everybody who
31 was involved with all these analysis who have
32 determined this. I don't want this to go on the
33 wayside. I think this will resurface some day when we
34 conduct more surveys to determine that the average is
35 roughly 12 moose. The average right now with no moose
36 being there is going to get knocked down below the 11,
37 but remember the last survey was 2005, and everything's
38 been closed since 2006 until now. So if we got a
39 survey sometime in a few years, it would be good to
40 start weighing those numbers back into towards the
41 average until there would be a sustainable harvest.
42 And in my mind since it is such a conservation, that
43 would be if the population was around 11 or 12 on an
44 average per year, that it be something like one moose
45 every four regulatory years between the two communities
46 of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek to split that one moose.

47
48 That's my thoughts.

49
50 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy. I've
2 got two questions for you real quick. And you kind of
3 alluded to something that I feel, having flown with my
4 son and that in the wintertime, and in a place like
5 Kings Bay, that it would be pretty hard -- if you flew
6 for an hour and there was any moose there, it would be
7 pretty hard to at least miss sign of the moose,
8 wouldn't it?

9
10 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, for sure. No
11 tracks is no moose there. They have a very -- like
12 Milo mentioned, a very limited habitat, not really a
13 lot of willows. There's cottonwood. They kind of
14 exist how moose do in lowland areas in the winter,
15 especially winters of deep snow. And just like deer in
16 Prince William Sound, they get pushed out to the tidal
17 areas. They do a lot of rooting around in the grass on
18 those flats, and the tide helps bring in some food for
19 them to get nutriments for their rumen and stuff, so if
20 there are not tracks there right now, the moose took a
21 major hit just like what the deer population has in
22 Prince William Sound.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Andy. And
25 that does -- that also was one of the points I was
26 going to bring up. I think in the past pretty much the
27 subsistence take there has been -- like it's pointed
28 out, has been opportunistic. It's been in the winter
29 time when they were -- it hasn't been with people going
30 way up in the valley. It's been when they were driven
31 right down where they definitely would show up at this
32 time of the year.

33
34 The other thing is, you put the
35 proposal in, didn't you?

36
37 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, I did.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You have the ability
40 to withdraw that proposal, you realize that?

41
42 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I would be willing to
43 withdraw that now in light of this, but don't be
44 surprised if it comes up in a future year. But the
45 problem is it's almost like pulling teeth to get this
46 survey done, but I'm really glad that the State came
47 around and did that as of late.

48
49 Thank you.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I think that we
2 might have disagreement on that, so Milo's going to
3 give me some information.

4
5 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, I just had a
6 suggestion. A lot of work has gone into this proposal,
7 and a lot of discussion has taken place, you know, at
8 the previous RAC meeting, these analyses, the .804
9 analysis. I'd hate to throw it all out. It would
10 probably be -- I think Pippa mentioned, that the .804
11 analysis could be put in to the record, if it was
12 passed and accepted by the Board. That would be a step
13 forward, set the stage for the future.

14
15 And there's some other possibilities
16 that we've talked in trying to adopt a Forest Service
17 opinion on this issue. One was do nothing, leave the
18 season closed. The other was pass it and let the in-
19 season manager keep the season closed. And another one
20 is what I just said, by, you know, if nothing else,
21 accept the .804 analysis and get it in regulation. So
22 there's just a few ideas for you guys.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

25
26 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes.

29
30 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Thank you, Milo,
31 for clarifying some things there. Is it possible for
32 me to make a motion to approve the .804 analysis, I
33 guess that's a separate issue, and perhaps make a --
34 put that in the record, and then make another proposal
35 to -- another motion to accept the proposal, modified
36 .804 analysis, that the two communities of Chenega Bay
37 and Tatitlek, if the moose population reaches an
38 average of 12 moose per year that one moose be
39 harvested between the two communities every four
40 regulatory years.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That I don't know at
43 this point in time, Andy. First of all what we have to
44 do is we need to go through all of agency reports on
45 it, and we have to have a motion. We don't even have a
46 motion on the table right now to deal with this
47 proposal. And at that point in time then an amendment
48 could be in order, and you could amend it that way.
49 You are part of this meeting, you are part of our
50 quorum, but that would have to be after we put the

1 motion on the table.

2

3 Am I correct with that kind of
4 analysis, anybody that can give me guidance on that.
5 Donald.

6

7 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. That's the
8 option of the Council. Since we're already discussing
9 this on record, we're going through the public process,
10 and we can get some agency reports and public comments
11 on it, and then the Council can adopt the proposal and
12 then make amendments and go forward as Mr. McLaughlin
13 suggested, but that's the will of the Council.

14

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. So at this
18 point in time, we've had our presentation, we've had
19 our analysis. We need to see if we have any agency
20 comments, like the Alaska Department of Fish and Game,
21 Federal agencies, and things like that.

22

23 Does Alaska Department of Fish and Game
24 have any comments.

25

26 ** MR. CRAWFORD: Yeah, our opinion on this --
27 yeah. Drew Crawford, Alaska Department of Fish and
28 Game.

29

30 Our position on Wildlife Proposal 14-
31 11, we continue to be opposed to it. Because of the
32 extremely low moose population in the Kings Bay portion
33 of Unit 7, the Department does not support the harvest
34 of bull moose, and particularly without designated
35 antler restrictions.

36

37 So we have the same position.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

40

41 Do we have any other Federal agencies
42 that have a comment or report on this.

43

44 (No comments)

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about Native
47 villages, tribal villages.

48

49 (No comments)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: InterAgency Staff --
2 oh, Milo.
3
4 MR. BURCHAM: Yeah, Milo Burcham,
5 Chugach Forest.
6
7 I basically just presented our agency
8 opinions, but I guess I wanted to restate it and add to
9 what Andy just said. I'd be cautious about getting a
10 hard number like your 12 into regulation. I think that
11 needs to be reviewed by biologists, and I think that
12 ought to be left open to discussion, and I don't want
13 to bind us to any specific number of moose right now,
14 you know, that would hinge on opening a season. So I'd
15 be cautious there.
16
17 But I do think it's important possibly
18 to recognize this .804 analysis, and I suggested a
19 couple other avenues that we could -- that you guys
20 could go down.
21
22 I don't know the procedure. You were
23 checking that out, Ralph, about exactly how to deal
24 with this, but there's people here who can help with
25 that.
26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.
28
29 MR. EVANS: I would like to echo Milo's
30 concern about putting a hard number over the 12.
31
32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have any
33 advisory group comments.
34
35 (No comments)
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How about any
38 neighboring Regional Councils. I don't think we have
39 -- we haven't got any of that.
40
41 Local Fish and Game Advisory
42 Committees, any of them have comments.
43
44 (No comments)
45
46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And there's no
47 national park resource committees involved with this.
48
49 Do we have any written comments,
50 Donald.

1 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. We did not
2 receive any written comments.
3
4 Thank you.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And do we have any
7 public testimony.
8
9 (No comments)
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have no requests for
12 public testimony in front of me, so now we need a
13 motion from the Council. And this is the Council's
14 wish how we wish to address this.
15
16 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.
17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
19
20 MS. CAMINER: I will move to adopt the
21 proposal.
22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Move to adopt
24 the Proposal WP14-11.
25
26 Donald, could you read WP14-11 to us.
27 And I think we should find the page it's on.
28
29 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair. 14-11, Proposal
30 14-11, a proposal submitted by Mr. Andy McLaughlin of
31 Chenega Bay, requests that Unit 7, that portion that
32 drains into Kings Bay, be opened for a limited moose
33 hunt of one bull per community, that would include
34 Chenega Bay, Cooper Landing, Hope and Tatitlek, every
35 four years.
36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So the proposal
38 requests one bull per community.
39
40 MS. CAMINER: We need a second so we
41 can discuss it.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have a second.
44
45 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'll second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy seconded it.
48 Okay.
49
50 You made the motion, speak to it,

1 please.

2

3 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Thank you, Mr.
4 Chair. Thank you, Andy for seconding, and for all the
5 work everybody's done on this.

6

7 We've heard quite a bit of information
8 here, and I think we do have several options as have
9 been discussed. One very good option that Andy's put
10 forward is that we could modify this wording perhaps.
11 We clearly have a conservation issue, so I can't
12 support the proposal as I've put it forward, or as it
13 has been put forward. But we do have some options that
14 could be put in place once it is determined that
15 there's not a conservation concerns, and that would
16 include further surveys in the future.

17

18 So one of those options might be to
19 modify this proposal perhaps to say, as Andy suggested,
20 alternating between Tatitlek and Chenega Bay every four
21 years. That would be one option, and then we would
22 also say that, you know, at this point we recommend it
23 be closed or it would be closed.

24

25 But we also heard information on the
26 .804 analysis, and to me it was more compelling that we
27 would limit to two of the eligible communities, and
28 that would be Chenega Bay and Tatitlek as well.

29

30 So that's what I'm thinking right now.

31

32 MR. EVANS: One thing I would like to
33 just clarify, that Andy's proposal was one moose,
34 probably a bull moose, every four years, not one bull
35 moose per community.

36

37 MS. CAMINER: Right.

38

39 MR. EVANS: So that is actually part of
40 an amendment as well. Just so it's all clear.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But may I ask a
43 question. Do we even have on the table as for
44 consideration a proposal to put an .804 on it if there
45 is no season. I mean, to me it looks to me like the
46 only proposal that we have on the table is WP14-11,
47 which requests one moose every four years. One bull
48 moose every four years limited to those communities.
49 But there is no proposal on the table to put an .804 on
50 it. And if there is no season, then I don't see how --

1 I mean, it would be nice to have that in place, but I
2 don't see how we have any justification at this point
3 in time with the notification that we've had to put an
4 .804 on it if there's no season.

5
6 MS. KENNER: Thank you for that
7 question, Mr. Chair. We actually did talk to the
8 solicitor about just this issue, and it was determined
9 that because we were bringing this up again at a second
10 meeting, and there has been notification, that indeed
11 it can be considered part of your proposal, because
12 it's part of your recommendation.

13
14 What we're doing is we're not going to
15 -- we're trying to provide opportunity to people, and
16 not reduce opportunity, and that was another
17 consideration.

18
19 As far as the .804 section of this, I'd
20 like you to know that you can choose not to adopt any
21 .804 recommendation, and in that sense that the
22 distribution of permits would have to be to anybody who
23 asked for one, anybody who is in the C&T determination
24 who wanted permit could get one.

25
26 If we go to a draw permit, we usually
27 have to do a Section .804 analysis to make sure that
28 everybody who is in the C&T is equally qualified for
29 the draw permit, and that we shouldn't eliminate some
30 of those Federally-qualified users.

31
32 You can modify your recommendation to
33 include only Chenega Bay and Tatitlek, and include
34 Cooper Landing and/or Hope. All of those options are
35 available to you within this proposal.

36
37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So correct me if I'm
38 wrong. We can amend the proposal that's on the table
39 to eliminate the hunting season at this point in time,
40 but to institute an .804 analysis to it.

41
42 MS. KENNER: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is
43 Pippa Kenner again.

44
45 You can maintain a closed season;
46 however, adopt the Section .804 determinations in
47 anticipation of the hunting season opening at some
48 point in the future. We have done this, and the Board
49 has done it.

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.
2
3 Donald.
4
5 MR. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've
6 got Karen Hyer, she's the deputy ARD for OSM, and she
7 wanted to provide some clarification and guidance.
8
9 Thank you.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.
12
13 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman and Council
14 members. I just checked, and I just want to make suer
15 we are on the same page. The .804 is not separate from
16 the analysis, so you either adopt the analysis or your
17 don't adopt the analysis. It's not that the .804 needs
18 a separate vote. That analysis has been adopted to
19 include the .804. So I just want to be clear on that.
20
21 And then the other thing is you either
22 oppose it -- no, excuse you. You either, what's the
23 work, do you oppose or.....
24
25 MS. KENNER: Support.
26
27 MS. HYER: Oppose or support, or you
28 table it. Just to make it clear, we don't support it
29 and then table it. You certainly can go on the record
30 supporting it, but the wording is to just defer it
31 actually. Or table, yeah.
32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy. Thanks, Mr.
34 Chair. I guess if we all look at Page 71, at the
35 bottom, that's the proposed Federal regulation that's
36 in front of us. So it does in fact include a season,
37 and it does include all the communities and words, and
38 it says one bull moose for each community. So that's
39 the wording that we have to work with and/or modify.
40 So hopefully that clarifies it a little bit.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We have a
43 motion on the table.
44
45 MS. CAMINER: Right.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, in discussion of
48 the motion, does anybody wish to put forward an
49 amendment.
50

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Andy.
4
5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. I would like to
6 make a motion to amend WP14-11 in two parts, to include
7 only Chenega Bay and Tatitlek, and to change the
8 harvest limit to on between the two communities every
9 four regulatory years.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So you are
12 amending it one bull every four years between the
13 communities of Tatitlek and Chenega. Am I correct.
14
15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, is that going to
18 be alternate, or is that going to be first come, first
19 served.
20
21 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I had kind of thought
22 first come first served, you know. That's the way I
23 would see it.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So just
26 basically the way you said it. One bull moose every
27 four years between the communities of Chenega and
28 Tatitlek.
29
30 Do I hear a second.
31
32 MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know
33 if it's appropriate or not, because of the rules here
34 and how it works, but what about the season, I guess on
35 top of what Andy said, since we have no moose in this
36 area.
37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, see, that's
39 where I'm at. That's why I don't know how we can deal
40 with something if we're not putting a season on it.
41 But it's said that we can.
42
43 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair -- go ahead,
44 Pippa.
45
46 MS. KENNER: Hi, I'm sorry. This is
47 Pippa again.
48
49 As long as we get the -- there's a
50 couple of routes to take, but what we really need to

1 know is what your intent is. I think your intent is
2 this, and that is, to have a season for non-Federally-
3 qualified, and that will be -- oh, excuse me, to have a
4 season for the Federally-qualified, but that season is
5 closed at this time. The harvest limit will be through
6 what this amendment proposal is to have a season of one
7 bull every four regulatory years for those who are
8 included in the Section .804 determination. And that
9 season is closed.

10

MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

12

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

14

MS. CAMINER: If we look at just above
16 it, the existing regulation, okay, Unit 7 moose, it's
17 closed. It's closed. But it seems like we could add
18 below that the eligible -- the communities we believe
19 are eligible based on the analysis that we've heard.
20 So you have a closed season, but you do list eligible
21 communities. And we can also express our intent on
22 should it open, here's how we'd like the system to
23 work.

24

MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman, Council
26 members. I just want to be very clear. There's a
27 difference between voting for a closed season, which
28 will go on our books, and deferring or tabling a
29 proposal.

30

CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My question is, could
32 you say that if the population warrants it, one bull
33 moose every four years between the communities of
34 Chenega and Tatitlek. Could you do that, or would --
35 Pat.

36

MS. PETRIVELLI: Okay. This is Pat
38 Petrivelli with the BIA.

39

The proposal you have before you, the
41 season was already closed, it has been closed. Someone
42 wanted to open the season, and then it was determined
43 that the .804 analysis had to be done. Now, I've
44 listened to all this discussion and the concerns, and
45 it was very interesting, but the purpose of an .804
46 analysis is when it is necessary to distinguish between
47 subsistence users in times of shortage. That's what
48 you use, those three criteria. So ANILCA said that, or
49 the law says, when there is a shortage of the
50 resources, you use those three criteria.

1 Now, there's evidently a shortage of
2 resources. There's a shortage of resources enough that
3 you cannot have an open season. But if the season is
4 opened, then you could follow the recommendations of
5 the analysis you've heard about, and maybe if you want
6 to read it before the meeting's over and change your
7 mind, but we've heard the information from the analysis
8 that said there were two communities that clearly
9 exhibit the criteria meant for a priority use under
10 ANILCA in a time of shortage. So you could make the
11 recommendations saying that Federal public lands are
12 closed to the harvest of moose and then just put,
13 except to residents of Chenega and Tatitlek, but then
14 it's still closed, the season would still be closed,
15 and then put in the Federal manager when resources are
16 available, will open he season and recommend conditions
17 when that season is open.

18

19 And then who know if 100 moose move in
20 there, then it could be open to all eligible users,
21 which would be Hope, Cooper Landing, all four
22 communities, because only four communities have a
23 customary and traditional use determination for those
24 resources. And then the people of Hope and Cooper
25 Landing could put in a special action and say, we want
26 to harvest in Kings Bay once the population grows.

27

28 But until the population grows -- but
29 there is the vehicle, all the information is there in
30 that proposed language. And I think Milo might have
31 suggested wording about having delegated authority to
32 monitor the population or somehow -- and I think he's
33 nervous about numbers, and that makes sense as I think
34 they just want to be conservative. But you could put
35 the number in, and he could have the opportunity to
36 testify before the Board and recommend a different
37 number, because the Board hasn't made the decision yet.
38 But if you agree with Andy, that 12 is the right
39 number, you could put that number in. But the
40 biologists would say, we don't like that number, and we
41 think of numbers different. But this would just be
42 your recommendation based upon -- but you would have to
43 have a reason why you put that number in. You're just
44 making a recommendation to the Board.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Do we have an
47 amended motion on the table at this point in time.

48

49 MS. CAMINER: Andy made a motion, but
50 it was not seconded.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It was not seconded.
2
3 MS. CAMINER: So maybe.....
4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we have a motion on
6 the table right now to accept WP14-11 as written.
7
8 MS. CAMINER: Right.
9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we are open for
11 amendments. Andy, your amendment wasn't seconded.
12
13 So at that point in time we're open to
14 other amendments. Does anybody have an amendment
15 they'd like to offer.
16
17 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. Perhaps a
18 suggestion is to say that Federal public lands are
19 closed to the harvest of moose except by the residents
20 of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek.
21
22 And we can say something along the
23 lines of we'd like to see delegated authority so that
24 if the populations become adequate for hunting that we
25 would suggest one bull moose, alternating between
26 Tatitlek and Chenega Bay taken every four years with
27 the season that we set up previously.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So your
30 amendment, to write it down, would be Federal public
31 lands are closed to the harvest of moose. We start
32 with the portion of Unit 7, that portion draining into
33 Kings Bay, public lands are closed, no open season to
34 the taking of moose by all users. Federal public lands
35 are closed to the harvest of moose, except for Chenega
36 and Tatitlek, right? Except for residents of Chenega
37 and Tatitlek.
38
39 MS. CAMINER: Yes. Well, except we
40 don't want to make it sound like it's currently open,
41 you know.
42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Federal public
44 lands are closed to the harvest of moose -- no, not --
45 well, figure out how to say this so we can have an
46 amendment that works.
47
48 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.
49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Andy.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: The way it could be --
2 somebody had mentioned previously something similar to
3 this. The Federal manager will recommend harvest when
4 population warrants it.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. But right now
7 we're working on having it closed except for the
8 communities of Tatitlek and Chenega, but except is not
9 a good word. Well, that's a word they use. They say,
10 Federal public lands are closed to the harvest of moose
11 except by residents of Akiachak, Akiak and et cetera,
12 et cetera, et cetera. So except is a purposely good
13 one.

14
15 So Federal public lands are closed to
16 the harvest of moose except by residents of Chenega and
17 Tatitlek. That takes care are of that part of the
18 portion.

19
20 Now, if we want to add to that, if the
21 population warrants it or whoever we want to do it, the
22 moose season will be one bull moose every four years
23 between the communities, you know. But at this point
24 in time, that's a moot point to me.

25
26 So let's get our amendment down on
27 paper so that we know what we are amending, so
28 everybody is on the same page.

29
30 I know, it's time for us to go. This
31 is a long one.

32
33 So let's take a look. Maybe we should
34 just do the first part of it.

35
36 The portion draining into Kings Bay,
37 public lands are closed. No open season to the taking
38 of moose by all users. Federal public lands are closed
39 to the harvest of moose, except by residents of Chenega
40 and Tatitlek, and stop right there.

41
42 (Some discussion, but mics are not on)

43
44 MS. KENNER: And then the delegated
45 authority is already there. But this will open by
46 special action,

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. So we have --
49 is that your amendment that it's the portion draining
50 into King's Bay public lands are closed, no open season

1 to the taking of moose by all users. And Federal
2 public lands are closed to the harvest of moose, except
3 by residents of Chenega and Tatitlek.

4
5 MS. CAMINER: And we could add.....

6
7 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair. I would
8 make it a motion as you read that.

9
10 MS. CAMINER: Andy, hold off just one
11 second. One more suggestion would be to add the
12 harvest limit underneath there so that we have all --
13 everything that we talked about here today included so
14 that if it is opened, our works done.

15
16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah, all inclusive
17 would be perfect when the population warrants a
18 harvest.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we're trying to
21 get the amendment down in black and white so that we
22 can get a second for it.

23
24 So, Judy, give us your amendment as you
25 want it written. You're making the amendment.

26
27 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Let me see if we
28 can get this all here. So the Federal public lands,
29 that portion draining into Kings Bay, are closed to the
30 harvest of moose except by residents of Tatitlek and
31 Chenega Bay. We could also then include the harvest
32 limit, which would be one bull moose alternating
33 between Tatitlek and Chenega Bay, August 10 to
34 September 20th -- every four years, August 10 to
35 September 20th. And then with season to be opened by
36 special action.

37
38 MR. BURCHAM: We're all struggling with
39 this right here. Pippa and I have been talking as
40 well. Delegated authority is already in place. The
41 Seward District Ranger can close a season in Unit 7.
42 So you could have a season, as you just suggested, that
43 the Seward District Ranger could close annually, or Pat
44 just suggested to me you could write, a season to be
45 determined by the in-season manager. The bag limit to
46 be determined by the in-season manager would be another
47 route to go.

48
49 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair. I guess my
50 comment would be we've already had all these

1 discussions. We didn't talk too much about season, but
2 we certainly talked about limits, so I'd kind of hate
3 to have that part get lost of it. I mean, I guess we
4 could say season I guess, because we really don't know.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy, I have one
7 question, and I don't know if you missed it on purpose
8 or you didn't. You said, that portion draining into
9 Kings Bay, public lands are closed except to. And that
10 would mean that it would be open to then. You should
11 say public -- I think it should say public lands are
12 closed, no open season to the taking of moose in Kings
13 Bay, and then have your next one that says Federal
14 public lands are -- you could say Federal public lands
15 are only open to the residents of Chenega and Tatitlek.
16 That would be a positive way to say it.

17
18 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Yeah.

19
20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that way you're
21 still maintaining the closed season. Otherwise, the
22 way you said it, there is an open season to Chenega and
23 Tatitlek. And then if we want to add the rest, let's
24 get this -- I'm going to write this down, and then
25 we'll see if we can get a second for it.

26
27 Okay. We're going to take this the way
28 it is on Page 71, we're going to take the first part
29 the way it is. That you agree to?

30
31 MS. CAMINER: Yes.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the second part
34 would say, Federal public lands are closed to all
35 Federal users except the residents of Chenega and
36 Tatitlek.

37
38 MS. CAMINER: Uh-huh.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Then, now if
41 you want to add something else, this is the point to
42 add it, or we can vote on this.

43
44 MS. CAMINER: Well, Andy, I'll look for
45 some feedback from you. I guess I would suggest we
46 could put the harvest limit in, and.....

47
48 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I do like that all
49 inclusive thing there. I'm trying to read my notes
50 here. Harvest being one bull moose every four

1 regulatory years with that season listed out, August
2 10th to September 20th, and season opened by
3 recommendation of Federal manager or something.

4
5 MS. CAMINER: And alternating between
6 the communities.

7
8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Write it down,
9 Judy, and I'll read it. And then we'll see if we can
10 get a second.

11
12 This is a hard one, because it's hard
13 to deal with something that's not there.

14
15 MR. BURCHAM: It is. And I don't like
16 to stir the pot here, but delegated authority allows
17 in-season managers to close seasons, not to open them.
18 And, will this regulation stating this allow an in-
19 season manager to do that. That's a question I don't
20 know the answer to.

21
22 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman, Council
23 members.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's why I think
26 we've got to be careful not to put too much into what
27 we're trying to do right now.

28
29 MS. HYER: Mr. Chairman, Council
30 members. We have a regulatory expert back in the
31 office that will help us get the wording exact. What's
32 really important is that we get your intent, because if
33 we take the intent, we can wordsmith it later. The
34 intent needs to be clear on the record.

35
36 MS. CAMINER: Mr. Chair.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

39
40 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Let's try this
41 again. So for Unit 7 moose, that portion draining into
42 Kings Bay, public lands are closed. The Federal public
43 lands are closed to all Federal users except to Chenega
44 Bay and Tatitlek. Then we could say, Federal public --
45 let's see. Then we could say the harvest limit is one
46 bull moose, alternating between the communities of
47 Tatitlek and Chenega Bay, with the season August 10 to
48 September 20th.

49
50 MR. BURCHAM: One bull moose every four

1 years.
2
3 MS. CAMINER: Excuse me?
4
5 MR. BURCHAM: One bull moose every four
6 years.
7
8 MS. CAMINER: Every four years,
9 alternating communities. Season opens by special
10 action. Is that better.
11
12 (Indiscernible - away from microphones)
13
14 MR. BURCHAM: Pippa's recommending
15 saying just opened by Federal action, and that leaves
16 it a little opened.
17
18 MS. CAMINER: Opened by Federal.
19
20 MR. BURCHAM: Federal special action.
21
22 MS. CAMINER: Season opens by Federal
23 special action.
24
25 MR. SHUSTER: I've got a quick
26 question. Is there any non-public lands in that
27 drainage?
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Subsistence
30 regulations don't apply on non-public lands. Non-
31 Federal public lands. They don't apply on State lands;
32 they don't apply on private lands.
33
34 MR. SHUSTER: It just says public lands
35 are close. Why do you have it in there.
36
37 MS. CAMINER: That would be our
38 jurisdiction, the Board's jurisdiction.
39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the only
41 jurisdiction we have.
42
43 MR. SHUSTER: Okay.
44
45 MS. STICKWAN: I second Judy's motion.
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Would you read
48 your amendment and see if we can get a second.
49
50 MS. CAMINER: Okay. I will try to read

1 this again. Unit 7 moose, that portion draining into
2 Kings Bay, public lands are closed. Federal public
3 lands are closed to all Federal users except to
4 residents of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek. Let's see.
5 Harvest limit, one bull moose, determined by in-season
6 manager, alternating between the communities of
7 Tatitlek and Chenega Bay every four years. August 10
8 to September 20. Season opens by Federal special
9 action. Season may be opened by Federal special
10 action.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second for
13 that amendment.

14
15 MR. EVANS: I have a little bit -- I
16 have just a little question. On the very first part
17 where you say that portion that drains into Kings Bay,
18 Federal public lands are closed. Should we say no open
19 season, because we're talking about the Federal public
20 lands in the next statement, so I think.....

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It should say no open
23 season at this point by all users.

24
25 MS. CAMINER: Yeah, that would
26 certainly be fine. I think we're making our intent
27 really well known now, so even if we don't get all
28 these words perfectly correct, I'm hoping that the
29 regulatory people in OSM and the agencies can help out
30 after this. Is our intent clear enough here?

31
32 MS. MILLS: I second the motion.

33
34 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Judy. Mr. Chair.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yes, Andy.

37
38 MR. McLAUGHLIN: The word alternating
39 is a little limiting factor between switching back and
40 forth. It was just between the two, everybody knows
41 each other between these two communities, and I don't
42 think you need to say alternating. Just between would
43 be more ideal.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. But let's pass
46 this amendment and then we can amend the amendment. We
47 needed to amend.....

48
49 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'll make a motion to
50 second that then.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So you're
2 seconding Judy's amendment, right?
3
4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.
5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Discussion on
7 the amendment. Now we can open up that amendment to
8 make comments on. Greg.
9
10 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Yeah. I've been
11 sitting here waiting to get to my discussion part.
12
13 (Laughter)
14
15 MR. ENCELEWSKI: But I'm glad I finally
16 got to it. So thank you.
17
18 Well, I would like to make a discussion
19 on several items. Number 1, I can't support opening a
20 season when there's no moose. No tracks. No moose.
21 No nothing.
22
23 The .804 analysis is outstanding to the
24 two communities and I think it should be accepted and
25 put in there and put into action at some form.
26
27 I totally oppose the in-season
28 management, and to go ahead and put special action from
29 the Federal Board. So I'll have to oppose this amended
30 thing.
31
32 I think that we're in kind of shaky
33 ground here when we have no harvestable moose. We have
34 (1) we're talking about a possibility of something
35 coming about. I don't really think at this time that
36 we should be discussing the hunt.
37
38 But my opinion.
39
40 Thank you.
41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: James.
43
44 MR. SHOWALTER: There was so much
45 discussion there, it's more confusing than it is
46 helpful.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
49
50 MS. STICKWAN: I guess if Andy agrees

1 with what's been proposed, I would support this,
2 because we're not really opening a hunt, we're just
3 saying that if it becomes -- if the population where it
4 can sustain a hunt, then we would be supporting that,
5 and we're just saying Chenega and Tatitlek would be the
6 ones to hunt there. And if he agrees to the in-season
7 management, then I would go along with that.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.

10

11 MS. MILLS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12

13 Boy, you know, I have a problem if
14 there are no moose, the type of management that's
15 occurring. And I know it's indicative across the whole
16 State with the amount of the hoofed wildlife that is
17 disappearing. And when you compare it to other places
18 in the United States, we are falling very, very short.
19 And to propose a hunt if there are no moose, seems kind
20 of moot. And I am more interested in how can we as a
21 Council promote and maybe get a report back from the
22 State or those that are managing our fish and wildlife,
23 what they are doing to bring these species back, and
24 what they feel is creating these problems, which most
25 of us know is predator -- you know, there's no predator
26 control. For that reason, I probably will have to
27 agree with Mr. Encelewski.

28

29 And I do have a lot of concern if there
30 -- I do not want to see a scorched earth policy, and
31 it's beginning to look that way.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

36

37 MR. SHUSTER: My concern was reduction
38 of opportunities for Hope and Cooper Landing. If
39 there's no moose, there's no opportunities. So I don't
40 have any problem with supporting the amendment.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy.

43

44 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr.
45 Chair. I would say that this proposal for this hunt is
46 opening the door for potential of harvest of a
47 subsistence resource. It's not closing a door for the
48 two communities at hand here.

49

50 That would be what I have to say.

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.

2

3 MS. CAMINER: Just a couple of
4 comments. Supporting this proposal supports closing
5 the area, so we're not opening it to hunting. We know
6 that there's no population to hunt and it would not be
7 wise to suggest.

8

9 And, secondly, I know several people on
10 the Council worry about delegation of authority, but
11 the Board has delegated authority to field people,
12 including this area. So I think if we want to change
13 that, it's something -- I mean, we've talked about this
14 before, that we put in our annual report or have
15 discussions with the Board about.

16

17 But having said that, I know Andy did
18 express one concern over the way this amendment was
19 phrased, so I wonder if I could make a slight
20 adjustment in my amendment, or do we have to vote on it
21 first?

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We've got an amendment
24 on the table we need to vote on.

25

26 MS. CAMINER: Okay. Gosh. Need to
27 read it all over again.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. I'm going to
30 make a comment. I don't know if Chairs are allowed to
31 do that. I have to go along with Greg. I personally
32 could very easily support the first part of the
33 amendment. I think we're complicating things pretty
34 much when we start dealing with seasons and bag limits
35 and stuff like that when we don't have any animals. I
36 myself would prefer if animals show up and there
37 becomes a viable population there, that somebody puts
38 in a proposal for a season, which is the way we
39 normally do things. And at that point in time we can
40 evaluate the season and the bag limits when there's
41 sufficient animals to have one. And so I'm going to
42 have to vote against the amendment. I would vote to
43 support the first part of it, but I would not vote to
44 support the second part of the amendment.

45

46 Now, do we have any more discussion.
47 Any comments. Or should somebody call the question on
48 the amendment.

49

50 Gloria.

1 MS. STICKWAN: I don't think Andy under
2 -- I don't understand what Andy's position is on the
3 in-season management part of it.

4
5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. Mr. Chair. I
6 think we've gone through a lot of time and painstaking
7 analysis of all the aspects and facets about this
8 entire situation, including those kind of bag limit,
9 brings into light just the potential for opening the
10 door for a subsistence harvest for the communities that
11 I'm trying to support with this. So that's where I'm
12 at with that, Gloria.

13
14 Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you calling the
17 question, Andy.

18
19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sure.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The question's
22 been called. All in favor of the amendment that's on
23 the table signify by saying -- raise your hands, we'll
24 have to do a hand count. All in favor the amendment
25 that's on the table signify by raising your hand.

26
27 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Aye.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Andy, is your hand up.

30
31 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, my hand's up.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. One, two, three
34 -- we have four positive.

35
36 All against, all not supporting the
37 amendment on the table, signify by raising your hand.
38 It's a tied motion.

39
40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You should do a
41 roll call vote,

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Let's do a roll
44 call vote. That would work much easier. All in favor
45 of the amendment signify by -- Andy, yes or no.

46
47 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Aye.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill.

50

1 MR. SHUSTER: Aye.
2
3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mary Ann.
4
5 MS. MILLS: No.
6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Judy.
8
9 MS. CAMINER: Yes.
10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ralph. No.
12
13 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Greg, no.
14
15 MR. SHOWALTER: No.
16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Gloria.
18
19 MS. STICKWAN: Yes.
20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a tie vote, four
22 to four. Motion carries.
23
24 SEVERAL: No, fails.
25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, motion fails. My
27 fault. Okay.
28
29 Now, you said you had another
30 amendment.
31
32 MS. CAMINER: Well, I think I'll modify
33 that thought.
34
35 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll make it.
36
37 MS. CAMINER: Go ahead, Greg.
38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Greg would like to
40 make an amendment.
41
42 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Well, you can go
43 ahead. If you drop the last part of your business,
44 I'll support it.
45
46 MS. CAMINER: Yes.
47
48 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Okay.
49
50 MS. CAMINER: Okay. My suggestion

1 would be we close the area, that portion draining into
2 Kings Bay, public lands are closed, no open season.
3 Federal public lands are closed to the harvest of moose
4 except by those residents of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek.
5 And we'll leave it at that.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I have a second.

8

9 MR. ENCELEWSKI: I'll second it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
12 seconded.

13

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Second.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now we have a
17 motion on the table that says that portion draining
18 into Kings Bay, public lands are closed, no open season
19 to the taking of moose by all users. Federal public
20 lands -- I've got to put my glasses on -- are closed to
21 the harvest of moose except by residents of Chenega and
22 Tatitlek.

23

24 MS. CAMINER: In Unit 7.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In Unit 7. In Unit 7,
27 that portion draining into Kings Bay. Okay.

28

29 Okay. With that on the table, any more
30 discussion.

31

32 (No comments)

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's in
35 order then. You can't make it -- oh, you seconded it.
36 You can make it.

37

38 MR. ENCELEWSKI: Okay. I made it.

39 Question.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
42 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

43

44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
47 saying nay.

48

49 (No opposing votes)

50

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries.
2
3 Now we have an amended proposal in
4 front of us that simply goes with the amendment that we
5 have. Any discussion on the amended proposal.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Hearing none, the
10 question's in order.
11
12 MS. CAMINER: Question.
13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
15 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.
16
17 IN UNISON: Aye.
18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
20 saying nay.
21
22 (No opposing votes)
23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The amended motion
25 carries unanimously.
26
27 MR. MIKE: Mr. Chair.
28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Donald.
30
31 MR. MIKE: It's 12:39 right now, and we
32 have joint session at 1:30. I wanted to give the
33 Council this opportunity to have time for lunch before
34 we reconvene jointly at 1:30, so this might be a good
35 time for the Council to break.
36
37 And just for the Council's information,
38 the per diem didn't reach our office, and what we are
39 authorizing is our Council guests that are staying at
40 this hotel, they can get lunch at the restaurant and
41 have them charged to their rooms, or they can order
42 room service at the hotel. And those services will be
43 deducted from your per diem, and then we'll send you a
44 balance per diem that's owed you.
45
46 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Donald.
49
50 Hearing that, at this time we will take

1 a break. The meeting is -- at 1:30 we have a joint
2 meeting.

3

4

(Off record)

5

6

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public, State of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 59 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME I taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 11th day of March 2014 in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 6th day of April 2014.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14